



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

The scheme of the Journal allows a tithe to *Brief Mention*. In earlier days there was not the same affluence of contributions as there is now. In those times many of my own articles were written to fill gaps and I had little scruple in making broad my phylacteries. Of late, I have been embarrassed by an excess of material and I feel that apologies are due on my part to both readers and contributors for the inordinate number of pages that I have occupied in the present volume to the exclusion of more strictly philological work; for as I near the end, I find myself reverting to the earlier stages of my long career. The article on Paulus Silentarius grew out of a *Brief Mention*, and the same thing is true of the paper entitled An Oxford Scholar in another part of the present number. These things ought properly to have been reserved for a projected volume of *Brief Mentions Suppressed and Unsuppressed*, which I had in contemplation some years ago, and I sympathize with the παρακλανοσύνη of those who are waiting to make their addresses to the public. But those who know the inside history of the Journal will pardon the superfluities of an editor who has renounced so much in order to furnish an arena for American scholarship and finds no other field open for the exercise of such activities as are left to him (A. J. P. XXXIII 227).

That consummate artist Jane Austen, the centenary of whose death was celebrated the other day, kept the turmoil of the great wars of her time out of her novels and when the world's great war of our time, of all times began, I tried to make the Journal a sheltered nook. But I have not succeeded. Eclipses of the sun repeat themselves under the foliage of rosebushes, and now that the word 'American' itself means war to the knife, the allusions become more patent and more pointed, although I have not forgotten my own admonitions against historical parallels and the so-called lessons of history. For many years the Germans have been the acknowledged leaders in Greek studies. Every now and then some German professor like the late Herr Jordan goes over bodily to the Roman camp, and the Graeculi are not handled with gloves by German exponents of classical perfection, but it is an inter-

esting speculation what will become of Greek studies in Germany after the war.

Much will necessarily be taboo. A correspondent informs me that a protest has been entered in Germany against including the Philippics of Demosthenes in the course of Greek studies. Perhaps the movement has been inspired from above,—the German ‘from above’, not the St. James ‘from above’. In Jackson’s *Memoir of Bywater* (p. 198), discussed in the earlier part of this number, it is recorded that the Emperor spoke airily, if not very tactfully to Bywater, a Professor of Greek, about the narrowing requirements of Greek in the German school system. The laborious analysis of Xenophon’s *Anabasis* by Joost (A. J. P. XIV 102) is the result of a conviction that this limitation to the Kaiser’s own range of reading would be welcome to the All Highest; and one is almost tempted to suspect that Wilamowitz’s proposal to jettison the Greek accents is due to some court story about the Kaiser’s schooldays. In the old days of the *Fliegende Blätter* there was a cartoon representing a subordinate official, some ‘*Staatshämorrhoidarius*’, bowing to the ground before his chief with the legend from Alexander von Humboldt ‘The curved line occurs only in organic nature’. Nothing is so well organized as Teutonic officialdom. We are and have been for years in the domain of ‘*Realpolitik*’ for which the ‘*Realgymnasium*’ had been preparing the way for many decades. And now quite apart from Wilhelm’s general attitude towards Greek, Demosthenes’ attitude towards the Emperor’s predecessor in the superman business must be excluded from the school as possibly offensive to the Kaiser. Run through *Olynthiacs* and *Philippics* and you will find significant phrase after phrase. I have space for a few only. 1, 5: ὅλως ἀπιστον οἶμαι ταῖς πολιτείαις ἢ τυραννίς. 2, 5: σφόδρ’ ἂν ἡγούμην καὐτὸς φοβερὸν τὸν Φίλιππον καὶ θαυμαστόν, εἰ τὰ δίκαια πράττονθ’ ἐώρων ἡϋξημένον. 9, 16: τὸ δ’ εὖσεβεῖς καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἂν τ’ ἐπὶ μικροῦ τις ἂν τ’ ἐπὶ μείζονος παραβαίῃη, τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν. 9, 26: πόλεις ἐπὶ Θράκης ἐῷ, ἃς ἀπάσας οὕτως ὡμῶς ἀνῆρκεν, ὥστε μηδ’ εἰ πώποτ’ ᾤκῆθησαν προσελθόντ’ εἶναι ῥᾶδιον εἰπεῖν. Very much alive are these ancients. A few months ago Deschanel quoted in an impassioned speech a passage from the prophecy of Darius in the *Persae* 821–2:

ὑβρις γὰρ ἐξανθοῦσ’ ἐκάρπωσε στάχυν
ἀτῆς, ὅθεν πάγκλαυτον ἐξαμᾶ θέρος.

In a Bryn Mawr doctoral dissertation on *The Spurious Speeches of the Lysianic Corpus*, ANGELA C. DARKOW main-

tains that there is no satisfactory proof that Lysias or, in fact, any of the orators of the Attic canon wrote speeches for court—the latter an audacious thesis—and therefore the objection to the disputed speeches of Lysias that they are unsuited to the practical business of the law, falls to the ground; and that the deviations from Lysianic or even classical usage may have their *raison d'être* in the *ethopoiia* for which Lysias was so renowned. The small number of extant speeches out of the portentously long list attributed to Lysias is in the eyes of the writer a proof that a severe censorship had been exercised by the ancient critics and is *prima facie* evidence in favour of the genuineness of the whole corpus, despite an occasional *εἰ γνήσιος*. Lysias, it seems, was no advocate employed in real cases but a literary artist and it is only as a literary artist that he appears in Plato's Phaedrus and as such he must be studied by us. According to Miss DARKOW Lysias gains rather than loses by this change of base. The note of actuality which some critics have recognized in such specimens of art as the wonderful First Oration is merely the effect of consummate skill. Proceeding on these assumptions, or what some people would consider assumptions, Miss DARKOW has carefully summarized and discussed the opinions of a number of scholars, for the speeches of Lysias have been fair game for the athetizers, Tray, Blanch and Sweetheart. Indeed there are only six of the thirty-one, the genuineness of which has not been impugned by dissertation-mongers and programmatists; and as Professor Sanders to whose guidance Miss DARKOW makes ample acknowledgment is a dog-fancier of high degree, an authority on the *Κυνηγετικός*, a specialist to whom I myself have appealed when attacked by a malapert critic in the matter of a Pindaric interpretation (A. J. P. XXVIII 110), I shall be forgiven for quoting the Xenophontean example I have imbedded in my S. C. G. 97: τὰ κυνίδια . . . κυβιστᾶν καὶ ἄλλα πολλὰ μανθάνει, especially as I gain thereby an opportunity to mend my translation and illustrate the origin of neuter plural and verb singular: *all puppydom (τὰ κυνίδια) learns to turn somersaults*; and intellectual somersaults are diverting rather than irritating. Read what Gomperz, the aged, has said of the youthful Bruns (A. J. P. XXIII 471). In all matters that involve the consultation of authorities I am οὐτ' ἐν λόγῳ οὐτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ for I am somewhat in the case of Lysias' ἀδύνατος, if ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἀδυνάτου is by Lysias—but being like Dogberry, a householder, I wonder how Lysias made his living after he lost all his property under the Thirty; for if there is scant evidence—as it seems to Miss DARKOW—that he followed the lucrative business of speech-writing, there is still less evidence that he took up the other and exceedingly lucrative business of teaching the young idea how to shoot the rapids of popular oratory.

The result of Miss DARKOW's studies is to let down the bars. The *χάρις* test which Dionysius applies is too vague (A. J. P. XXXIV 488). What *χάρις*, which Miss DARKOW translates 'charm', is to one may not be *χάρις* to another. Another test, that of *καθαρότης*, comes to naught by reason of Lysias' *ethopoia*, as we have just seen. This is quite in line with Professor Sanders' contention as to the occasional use of *ἄν* with the future in Plato (A. J. P. XXXVII 42-61). Grammatical propriety is deliberately sacrificed to dramatic propriety. The man in the street is made to speak his own language. He says not 'tisn't' but 'tain't' and, in the eyes of the purist, Anstey's Tinted Venus becomes a tainted Venus, and the *χάρις* is lost. One recalls Bekker's famous characteristic of Cobet's Homeric criticism: 'Die seele seiner kritik ist nun einmal purismus, straffzügeliger, scheuklapseliger purismus.'—Hom. Blätter II 54. In his critical introduction to his ed. of Lysias Cobet is on safer ground. The sleuth-hounds of grammar and diction have nosed out many such things in Xenophon, and who has not yielded to the temptation in the region of *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*? (A. J. P. XXVII 485.)

But, though I am painfully aware of the physical limitations (A. J. P. XXXVII 232) that bar my serious pursuance of the subject, Lysias is to me a name to conjure with, and I hope I shall be pardoned for recalling the part the son of Kephalos has played in my life—for my living has also been my life, as it is with all real teachers of Greek. Yes—the name itself has interested me, and some years ago, forgetting my favourite quotation 'non omnis aetas, Lyde, ludo convenit', I set up a mock defence of Teichmüller's identification of the Dionysodoros of Plato's Euthydemus with Lysias. Lysias, I said, is evidently the short for Lysanias, the name of his grandfather, and I propounded the equation $\Lambda\upsilon\sigma\alpha\nu\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma = \Lambda\upsilon\alpha\acute{\iota}\oslash\varsigma = \Delta\acute{\iota}\omega\nu\upsilon\sigma\oslash\varsigma$ —a winged word which was promptly hawked at by a mousing owl of a German reviewer.¹ My first acquaintance with Lysias goes back to 1850, when I bought out of my scant allowance a copy of the Berlin ed. of the Attic orators, to find alas! as I went on in my studies that I had been swindled by somebody. A leaf of the *Παναθηναϊκός* of Isokrates had taken the place of a leaf of the *Περὶ παραπρεσβείας* of Demosthenes. This is no solitary experience in the case of German editions, and I have occasionally registered a complaint (e. g. A. J. P. VIII 119). The mention of those Berlin days calls up the image of Johannes Franz (*Φρασικλῆς*) who admitted me to his Schola Graeca and gave me the name *Χρυσοβραχίων*. He too is a Lysianic reminis-

¹ A. J. P. XXXV 364.

cence, for he edited Lysias in the year in which I was born. For years my favourite edition was the pretty pocket-edition by Westermann, which I proceeded to disfigure by marginal and other notes. It perished, to my sorrow, in the flood of water turned upon my library at the time of the Johns Hopkins fire. The scholar to whom I owe my first introduction to Lysias was Rauchenstein, the same who helped me in my first studies of Pindar. It may seem strange to some that the same man should have been an enthusiastic student of two authors so diverse as Lysias and Pindar (A. J. P. XXIV 108), but such a one has never considered the processes of wine-taster and tea-taster. Somewhere in the 'to-hu bo-hu' of my MSS there is a Greek exercise-book, based on Lysias, a safer model than Xenophon. Fifty years ago when a local Sir Oracle said to me that his test of Greek scholarship was a mastery of Pindar and Athenaeus, I ventured to remark that my test was an honest enjoyment of Lysias. So much of our enjoyment is factitious. In a series of studies entitled 'On the Steps of the Bema' I made a large place for Lysias, and illustrated the chapter 'Anarchy *plus* a street constable' (a Carlylese title) by the Third Oration. In those early days there was no American edition of Lysias and when at last one appeared, I wrote to the Nation an angry protest against the untimely birth, a protest which led to a correspondence with Mr. Garrison and subsequent work for our leading critical journal, as I have recorded in the Jubilee Number (July 8, 1915). There are other American editions in one of which there is or was a misleading note on the memorable asyndeton at the end of Or. XII. Of Morgan's excellent edition I have said something but not enough (A. J. P. XVI 396). One of the few emendations that I proposed he accepted (VII 14), but alas! I found afterwards that I had been anticipated, and a like fate befell another emendation by which I got rid of the impossible *ἐλεύσεσθαι* (XXII 11). See A. J. P. III 228. Professor Adams has had his meed of praise and thanks from all American lovers of Lysias. His edition is an admirable *Praeparatio Rhetorica* for the study of the Greek orators. In the years of my Olympiad in which the Attic orators formed the centre about which our studies revolved, Lysias was a conspicuous figure. The general scheme was suggested by Dionysius of Halicarnassus who had rashly maintained that in certain spheres it would be hard to distinguish between Lysias and Demosthenes (A. J. P. XXV 357). In the private orations the subjects minimize differences but even there the differences between the orators can be brought to the consciousness of the student by methods, some of which were unknown to the ancient critics. The very passages cited by Dionysius, *De admiranda* vi, p. 985, are wide apart, and comparative studies of orations by different orators in handling like themes formed a

good ἀλυσθήρα for the young horsemen and the old hobby-rider. I do not repent me of the exercises imposed on the students of style, and a noteworthy result was the dissertation of Kirk, which deals with the private orations of Demosthenes and which has found favour in the eyes of those who know (A. J. P. XVII 391; XIX 234). One Seminary exercise consisted of a comparison between Lysias III, already referred to, and Demosthenes LIV, much admired by most students of Demosthenes, but vilipended or rather vilified by Bruns (A. J. P. XXV 356 fn.), cocksurest of the cocksure, who made the fatal slip of calling it ὑπὲρ Κόνωνος instead of κατὰ Κόνωνος, a parallel to the intelligent juryman, who was puzzled by the recurring words 'plaintiff' and 'defendant'. The dissertation of Devries on the Ethopoia of Lysias belongs to the early days of the seminary and Holmes's Index to Lysias projected on a plan, which seemed to preclude the mistakes made in so many indexes, is due to the same environment. In this Index, as Miss DARKOW remarks, Holmes has included the Ἑρωτικός of the Phaedrus. Vahlen's advocacy of Lysianic authorship stemmed the tide which had been running the other way, but Miss DARKOW thinks that Weinstock has opened the channel again, and made Plato responsible for the speech. Old Gorgias called Plato a new Archilochos, but to tell the truth, it seems hardly fair even for an Archilochos to create a *pastiche* (A. J. P. XXXV 231) and treat it as if it were the genuine work of the author ridiculed (A. J. P. XXVI 243). But the Zeus of Greek literature was capable of sophistic proceedings in his dealings with the sophists.

When the wielders of Thor's hammer, foretold of Heinrich Heine descendant of the prophets of old, had made some progress in destroying the temples of Christ, the son of an un-German god, there was some discussion among the followers of an un-German creed as to the course to be pursued after the war, whether to restore what used to be called in pseudo-classic style the sacred fanes that had been demolished or to let them remain to be a perpetual reminder of the ruin that had been wrought. It is an old problem, a problem which the Greeks had solved in their way. But what has called forth this *Brief Mention* is not the historical parallel but the impressive lesson as to the hopelessness of literary fame—a theme on which Bagehot and Stapfer and many others have enlarged. It is then not the case of the Cathedral of Reims but the case of Isokrates that I have in mind. If there ever was an elaborate piece of literary work it is the Panegyricus of Isokrates and yet a certain champion of Hellenism, who had taken all Greekdom for his province has actually reported

the action of the Greeks as recorded somewhere by somebody. I am going to be as vague as he was and content myself with transcribing Isok. Panegy. 156: διὸ καὶ τοὺς Ἴωνας ἄξιον ἐπαινεῖν ὅτι τῶν ἐμπρησθέντων ἱερῶν ἐπηράσαντ' εἴ τινες κινήσειαν ἢ πάλιν εἰς τάρχαϊα καταστήσαι βουλευθείεν, οὐκ ἀποροῦντες, πόθεν ἐπισκευάσωσιν, ἀλλ' ἔν' ὑπόμνημα τοῖς ἐπιγυγνομένοις ἢ τῆς τῶν βαρβάρων ἀσεβείας, καὶ μηδεὶς πιστεύῃ τοῖς τοιαῦτ' εἰς τὰ τῶν θεῶν ἑξαμαρτεῖν τολμῶσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ φυλάττωνται καὶ δεδίωσιν, ὁρῶντες αὐτοὺς οὐ μόνον τοῖς σώμασιν ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἀναθήμασι πολεμήσαντας. However as the Germans resent the title of 'barbarians' so freely bestowed on them, they might find some consolation in applying to the strategy of the Allies Dem. 4. 40: οὐδὲν δ' ἀπολείπετε, ὥπερ οἱ βάρβαροι πυκτεύουσιν, οὕτω πολεμεῖν Φιλίππῳ. καὶ γὰρ ἐκείνων ὁ πληγεὶς αἰεὶ τῆς πληγῆς ἔχεται, κἂν ἐτέρωσε πατάξῃς, ἐκεῖσέ εἰσιν αἱ χεῖρες, κτέ. But all military criticisms are open to revision and retort.

Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit. In the Corrigenda of this number (p. 462), Professor Gildersleeve refers to Jebb's misquotation of the famous line of Goldsmith's epitaph. It may be interesting to note that Jebb was not the first sinner. Dean Stanley was guilty of the same offence, and, if I mistake not, it was he that led Jebb astray. In the fifth edition of the Historical Memorials of Westminster Abbey, an edition which 'is printed from the copy left by the Dean at his death, and containing his final corrections and additions,' there still appears the following (p. 279): 'But the whole inscription shows the supreme position which Goldsmith occupied in English literature; and one expression, at least, has passed from it into the proverbial Latin of mankind—*Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit.*' To this passage is appended the following note: '*Nullum scribendi genus quod tetigit non ornavit.* (Epitaph.)' Compare with this the words of Jebb, Essays and Addresses, p. 503: "'Goldsmith," he said, "was a man who, whatever he wrote, always did it better than any other man could do"—a judgment which stands in the Latin of his famous epitaph on Goldsmith as *nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*, "he touched nothing which he did not adorn."' Jebb was too good a scholar to have written *nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*, unless he had had the above passage of the Memorials before him and had really believed the line to be part of the epitaph.

If G. Birbeck Hill (Boswell's Life of Johnson, vol. iii, p. 82, footnote 3) is to be trusted, Dean Stanley originally perpetrated the following note on his misquotation: 'Professor Conington calls my attention to the fact that, if this were a genuine classical expression, it would be *ornaret*. The slight

mistake proves that it is Johnson's own.' The first edition of Dean Stanley's work is not accessible to me. In the second edition, the author tried to rectify his blunder by the substitution of the footnote cited above, and this footnote was retained in subsequent editions. But the attempt was only partially successful. To say nothing of the new inaccuracy of citation—the words *scribendi genus* ought to be enclosed in brackets to show that they do not actually appear in the epitaph—the author persisted in making the epitaph responsible for the origin of a proverbial expression the Latinity of which is doubtful and is a perversion of that of the original.

The original seems to have emanated from the pen of Boswell, the biographer of Dr. Johnson. In his account of the year 1763, Boswell gives a sketch of Goldsmith in which occurs the following remark: 'No man had the art of displaying with more advantage as a writer, whatever literary acquisitions he made. "*Nihil quod tetigit non ornavit.*"' To this remark, the author appends the footnote: "See his Epitaph in Westminster Abbey, written by Dr. Johnson." It seems likely that Dean Stanley had this passage in mind, but that he quoted from memory, with the resultant unhappy transposition of the words *quod* and *tetigit*.

Though Boswell, to warrant his own estimate of Goldsmith, refers specifically to the epitaph, there can be little doubt that he was but giving Latin expression to a favorite dictum of Johnson's. Cradock, in his *Literary and Miscellaneous Memoirs*, vol. iv, p. 286, tells us that 'Johnson (when Goldsmith was absent), would frequently say, "Why, sir, whatever that man touches he adorns."' This harmonizes with another statement of his, which has been used by Hill, l. c., to show that Johnson was merely repeating himself in his epitaph on Goldsmith. The statement is this (*Memoirs*, vol. i, 231): 'When a bookseller ventured to say something rather slightly of Dr. Goldsmith, Johnson retorted:—"Sir, Goldsmith never touches any subject but he adorns it."'

A word or two remain to be said with regard to the dictionaries of quotations. At least three of the most widely used works of this kind cite the line of the epitaph, *nullum quod tetigit non ornavit*, to which is added the translation, 'He touched nothing that he did not adorn.' There is double ground for dissatisfaction with this. The Latin is not quotable, and the translation does not fit the citation. The Latin, as has been shown, is an adaptation by Johnson of his own dictum to the needs of his epitaph on Goldsmith. The English, it will be noticed, is a translation of Boswell's adaptation of the dictum to his own particular requirements. The obvious remedy would be to do away with the line of the epitaph in the cyclopedias of quotations and to insert in its place the

version of Boswell, which would have the triple merit of being eminently quotable, of removing the present incongruity between the Latin text and the English translation, and of eliminating, in a large measure, the danger of misquotation.¹

C. W. E. MILLER.

¹ The timeliness of the above remarks is apparent from a very recent misquotation, to which Professor Mustard has just called my attention: 'And whether he <Dr. Mackail> is explaining the *Pervigilium Veneris*, translating Virgil or Homer, or imaginatively describing Virgil's outlook on his native land, it may justly be said of him, *Nihil tetigit quod non ornavit*.' (Proceedings of the Classical Association, Jan. 1917, Vol. XIV, p. 103.)

CORRIGENDA.

P. 223, l. 18. Schikaneder wrote 'Führt *Liebe ihn* zur Pflicht'.—H. C. G. B. It was impossible at the time to verify my quotation and a lapse of memory after sixty-five years is pardonable—perhaps. As time goes on, I take less and less comfort from other people's blunders. Still my slip is venial when one recalls Jebb's misquotation of the famous epitaph of Johnson on Goldsmith which appears, and that in an essay on Johnson, *Essays and Addresses* p. 503, where 'nullum (sc. genus) quod tetigit, non ornavit' appears as 'nihil tetigit quod non ornavit' (ornaret?)—following carelessly and ungrammatically the familiar translation, 'touched nothing that he did not adorn'.

P. 227, l. 3 from bottom. Before 'of this sacrilegious encroachment' insert 'in specimens'.

P. 339, l. 28. Professor Hutton is not responsible for the identification of the Southern cause in the Civil War with that of Prussian Junkerdom. The pellet was aimed at the Northern press and its file-leader, the *New York Times*, and I regret that it hit an innocent bystander, who has naturally entered a protest.

B. L. G.